40

Scott. II-27—45,806—18-12-30.

Law (Edu) (1931) Department.

Ms. SERIES.

G.O. No. 1746

DATED 3-10-1931

[Despatch Abstract.]

Council Office.

Starred Question

Mr. [illegible] Sreshta

THE LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

* 395. Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state--

(a) whether it is a fact that Government had promised the municipal council ~~[illegible]~~ Mangalore, a subsidy not exceeding one half of the actual cost subject to the maximum of Rs. 1,515 towards the cost of the acquisition of land for the extension of the municipal elementary school at Bolar;

[illegible]

(b) whether it is a fact that Government have refused to pay ~~a~~ the subsidy promised after the acquisition of the said land on the ground that the cost of the acquisition has exceeded the original estimate;

[illegible] 1510

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to pay at least the amount promised, if not, why not;

(d) whether it is a fact that a similar subsidy was promised towards the acquisition of a site for the Market Ward School; and

(e) whether the said subsidy has been paid after the acquisition of the site and if not, for what reasons?

MA 2871

Kd 2871

2/2871

361 2

Education dept.

Draft answer.

[illegible] Question

[illegible] S. [illegible]roshta

[illegible] LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

395. Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state--

(a) whether it is a fact that Government had promised the municipal council ~~Mangalore~~ Mangalore, a subsidy not exceeding one half of the actual cost subject to the maximum of Rs. 1,515 towards the cost of the acquisition of land for the extension of the municipal elementary school at Bolar;

(a) Yes;

(b) whether it is a fact that Government have refused to pay ~~a~~ the subsidy promised after the acquisition of the said land on the ground that the cost of the acquisition has exceeded the original estimate;

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to pay at least the amount promised, if [illegible]

Re. 278A

27.1.31

The payment of subsidy was refused because (1) it was reported that the building on the site had been altered ~~subsequent to~~ after the promise of a subsidy, ~~and~~ was unsuitable for school purposes & should be

(b) & (c). The payment of subsidy w ~~[illegible]~~ refused ~~ax~~ as the building ~~construct~~ after alterations made subsequent to on the site ~~after~~ the promise of a sub from Govt. ~~was made~~ was reported to be quite unsuitable for school purposes and should be demolished and as the pre demolished and (2) the previous

sanction of Govt. to the revised estimate had not been obtained. The Govt do not propose to reconsider the orders already passed.

(d) whether it is a fact that a similar subsidy was promised towards the acquisition of a site for the Market

d) Y e s;

G. 593 E.M.
3.4.30
(P)

(e) whether the said subsidy has been paid after the acquisition of the site and if not, for what reasons?

(e) A subsidy not exceeding Rs 10,500 was promised in 1926, towards the purchas of buildings for four schools of which th Market Ward school was one.

G.O. No. 735
30.4.26
(H)

In 1929 the Council proposed to construct buildings for two of the schools at a cost far in excess of the original estimate for the four schools and to defer the construction of buildings for the other two schools for want of funds, the Market Ward school being one of ~~them~~ these. The Council was asked to prepare plans and estimates for the two schools on a ~~much~~ more economical basis and to submit them for the consideration of Govt. ~~Subsequently~~ In 1930 the Council

L. 6
G.O. No. 2484
27.11.29
(L)

(L)

~~3~~ 4

requested the payment of a subsidy for a site purchased for the Market Ward school against its previous decision to postpone the scheme for the constru ~~tion~~ of a building for the school. It did not also submit revised plans and estimates for buildings for the two other schools referred to. Payment of a subsidy was refused as the Govt considered that the Council should hav confined its attention to immediate requirements instead of purchasing a site which would not be required in th near future.

l by
29/1/31

AG
27-1.

26.1.31

Edn Dept

10/26·7

C. 278 A

Memo 278 A-2 D 26·3·31

Subsidy to the Municipal Council, Mangalore, towards the cost of a site for a building for the Bolar boys' school.

Copies of question No. 361 asked by ~~[illegible]~~ Mr M. S. Sreshta at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st January 1931, ~~and the answer given thereto and of the~~ supplementary questions and the answers thereto are forwarded to the D.P.I. who is requested to report whether it is a fact that the building ~~that~~ which originally stood on the site was ~~not very suitable~~ recommended by the Dt Educl authorities as very suitable for the purpose of a ~~and if so~~,

Secd

AD
25·3

24/3/31

26/3

27/3·31

To the D.P.I. (memo) & copy of qn (January)

27·7

12/5

6-7-31

Remind after a month.

and Pantlandpettah Girls' School and in September 1927 estimates aggregating to Rs.7,760 for construction of two buildings were sent to the Director of Public Instruction for his sanction with reference to G.O.No.3215, L & M., dated 7.9.1925. In August 1928, the Director returned the estimates for revision in the light of the remarks made by him in his letter R.C.No. 2162 B.27, dated 15-8-1928. The estimates were revised and resubmitted in December 1928 but were again returned in February 1929, for making provision for latrines, wells, and compound wall. The estimates as further revised aggregated to Rs.30,140 for the two schools against the original estimate of Rs. 21,000 for four schools. Owing to the heavy cost involved and for want of funds it was proposed to defer the construction of buildings or acquisition of sites for the Market Ward Boys' and Kadri Girls' Schools so that atleast two of the schools, with the funds available, may be provided for with buildings immediately though provision of buildings for all the four schools was an urgent necessity. The estimates for the two buildings were however returned by Government for revision so as to provide for cheaper and smaller buildings capable of expansion to meet future requirements -vide G.O.No. Ms. 2484 dated 27th November 1929. (B)

In para 4 of G. O. No. 1679 L. E., dated 11th August 1928 Government had stated that the promises made in 1927--28 and previous years will subsist till the the end of 1929--30 and if the works were not completed before the end of March 1930 the promises would lapse. It was not possible to revise the estimates, get the sanction of the Director and construct the two buildings before the end of March 1930 and the promise of the subsidy sanctioned for the four buildings would have

automatically

automatically lapsed. The provision of accommodation for the Market Ward Boys' School was also an urgent necessity. The building originally proposed to be acquired for the purpose was subsequently found not suitable. There was an alternative site selected for the purpose but the Revenue authorities had valued it at Rs. 7,395 in 1926 and its acquisition under the Land Acquisition Act had been dropped owing to the cost being considered heavy. The site was about to be sold to a private party by the owner and its subsequent acquisition would have cost the council much more. The owner was approached and induced by some of the councillors to part with it for a lesser amount in view of its being used for a public charitable purpose. He agreed to sell it to the council for Rs. 6,540-13-0 cost included -- a smaller amount than that at which it was assessed by the Revenue authorities. The District Educational Officer and the Executive Engineer had also been consulted and they found the site suitable for the school. The council would have lost the chance of purchasing the site on the liberal terms which the owner was induced to offer, if the purchase had been delayed and there was no other suitable site available in the locality for the purpose. The immediate purchase of the site was thus a necessity and the terms were highly favourable to the Council. Under the circumstances I request that you will be pleased to move Government to reconsider their orders and sanction the payment of a subsidy equivalent to half the cost involved

Your obedient servant,

Vice Chairman,M.C.

10 6

C.F. 30.

Education **DEPARTMENT.**

GOVERNMENT OF
12 MAY 1931

Received .... 19 . *Registered* 19

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
11 JUN 1931
MAD.

13

L.Ed. 2166 A
12/5/31

Subject.

Legislative Council question
Subsidy Municipal Council, Mangalore cost of a site for a building for the Bolar boys' school.

ENCLOSURES.
No. ....
....
Spare copies ....

R.C. No. 584 B/31

Station Madras, *Dated the* 9th May 1931 19

From (Name) R.G. Grieve, Esq., M.A., C.I.E.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Law and Education Department.

Sir,

With reference to Government Memo No. 278 A-2 dated 26th March 1931, I have the honour to report that none of the inspecting officers recommended that the buildings which orginally stood on the site under reference were suitable for school use.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

DLReddi

for Director of Public Instruction.

P.V.S. 9/5

7/11.5

Education Deptt

Memo No. 2166A-3 d 14.8.31

Subsidy - school building Municipal council, Mangalore - Letter from the D.P.I., No. 584 B/31 date 9-5-31.

G 14/8.

[illegible] 14/8

15/14/8

p 10 C.F.

+ Remind 18/9.

The D.P.I. is requested to report whether a subsidy will have to be paid to the Municipal council, Mangalore, towards the cost of ~~the extensions for~~ extending the existing building of the Bolar Boys' school, ~~for which~~ on the ~~a~~ site ~~has been~~ newly acquire by the council. The Director is also requested to ascertain and report when the construction of the building for the Market Ward Boys' School, for which a site has been acquired by the council, will be taken

1-2

p and whether a ubsidy will have to be paid from Provl. funds towards the cost of the uilding. The amount of subsidy that will be applied for in each case hould also be ~~estimated~~ reported

ME
12/8

13.8

12/8

Despd
No. 1528

To

The D.P.I.

Reminder 15-9-31.

13

L.E. 4068A
22.9.31

C.F. 30.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Received ....19 . *Registered*..19

2[illegible] SEP 1931

Subject.

Subsidy - School buildings - Municipal Council, Mangalore.

ENCLOSURES.
No. ....
....
Spare copies.................................

R.O.C.No. 584 B/31

Station Mangalore, *Dated the* 17th September 1931 19 .

From (Name) R.G.Grieve Esq., M.A., C.I.E.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

LAW EDUCATION Department.

pp 11-12 ante

Sir,

With reference to Government Memo No. 2166 A-3 dated 14th August 1931, I have the honour to state that I had addressed the Chairman, Municipal Council, -- Mangalore in the matter and he reports that a subsidy of Rs 1500 representing half the estimated cost of Rs 3000 will be required towards the extension of the Bolar Boys' school.

2. He also reports that the work of constructing a building for the Market Ward Boys' school will be -- undertaken immediately after the subsidy is sanctioned

BSM

[illegible] 14

pp 15-16 infra

A full report on this proposal is being submitted in my letter R.C.No. 1540 B/31, dated 17th September 1931.

I have the honour to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

for Director of Public Instruction

P.R.K. 18/9

18/9

15

Nx 4007 F
22.9.31.

C.F. 30.

Education **DEPARTMENT.**

Received .... 19 . *Registered* .... 19 .

[illegible] 1931

Subject.

[illegible]ity—construction of [illegible] Municipal Council, [illegible]ra.

Enclosures.
No. ....
....
Spare copies....................

[illegible] No. [illegible] 31

Station Madras, *Dated the* [illegible] 19

From (Name) [illegible]

(Designation) [illegible]

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

[illegible] Department.

Sir,

In submitting [illegible]

[illegible]-31/[illegible] dated [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] I have the honour to state [illegible]

2. The Chairman, Municipal Council, [illegible]

[illegible] grant towards [illegible] building

in the municipal area [illegible] estimated

cost being Rs. 8,000. The school [illegible]

building in [illegible] [illegible]ate

accommodation. The average [illegible]

school are 97 [illegible] respectively [illegible]. The

District Educational Officer [illegible] is of [illegible]

Kp 17-19
infra

BM

16

urgent nature. There are no schools for boys closeby, which can be amalgamated with this; there is only a girls' school with a strength of 162 pupils and the Municipal Education Committee is not in favour of amalgamating the girls' school with the boys' school. The plan of the building is suitable.

KP 11-12 ante

p 18 infra

3. The Council has already purchased a site and the payment of a grant towards the cost of site is under the consideration of Government-Vide Government Memo No. 21[illegible] A-3 dated 1[illegible]-8-[illegible]

. The Council is prepared to meet one half of the cost from its general funds.

5. In these circumstances the payment of a grant may be considered if Government have funds to provide for new schemes in1932-33.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Director of Public Instructio

S V 18-9

JV
18/9

building will be met from the general funds of the council.

Buildings are required for many other schools but at present application for a subsidy has been made in respect of only one as the same is very urgently required.

(copy)

Annexure *

Application of the Municipal Council for Grant from the Government required in 1932-33

Name of the local body	Particulars of scheme	Total estimated cost	Amount already sanctioned from Provincial funds including the provision in the Civil Budget estimate for the year current		Amount required from Provincial funds in the ensuing year		Amount required from Provincial funds in years subsequent to the ensuing year		How the balance of the cost will be met	Date on which the loan in column (6) should be disbursed	Whether detailed plans and estimates have been accorded technical sanction by the competent authority	In the case of schemes for which a loan or grant has already been provided in the Civil Budget estimate in the year current — (a) Whether the work has been started and if not (b) Whether there is a reasonable certainty of the work being started by the 1st February of the year current	Source from which the annuity for the loan in columns (6) and (8) will be found	Remarks — (Any remarks as to the special importance or urgency of the scheme may be added here)
			Loan	Grant	Loan	Grant	Loan	Grant						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Naugaon Municipality.	Construction of a building for the [illegible] Ward Boys School	Rs 8000/-	Nil	Nil	Nil	Rs 4000/-	Nil	Nil	The balance amount of Rs 4000/- will be met from the general funds of the Council.	Nil	Estimate has been prepared and enclosed with a plan.	The work will be started immediately after the Grant is sanctioned	Nil	Vide covering Letter

Municipal Office
N'Naugaon 29-7-1931

For Chairman N.M.

C. F. 92—10-9-28.

Education DEPARTMENT.

LE4146A
28.9.31.

Branch.

REMINDER.

To the Director
of Public Instruction

The undersigned ~~has the honour to invite~~ is directed to invite ~~invites~~ attention to the communication noted in the margin and to request that this reminder may be returned at once with information as to—

Memo No. 2166 A-3, dated 14-8-31

(1) the stage at which the matter now is,

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, ~~and~~

(3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.

2. It is requested that the reply to this reminder may be sent not later than

Office Edn. Deptt.

Ramanujachari 18/9
Signature.
a.r. 25/9

Station Fort St. George

Designation Asst. ~~Deputy~~ Secy. to Govt.

Dated 18/9/1931

SUBJECT.

Subsidy - school buildings - Municipal council, Mangalore

18/9-

REPLY.

To The Secretary to Government,
Law(Education) Department

Resubmitted.

2. A reply was already submitted in th office letter R.C.No.584 B/31 dated 17-9-31.

for Director of Public Instruction

la
3/7

3-JUL 1931
DEPARTMENT

Extract from the Tour address ~~to be~~ already presented to Hon- the Chief Minister to the Government of Madras by the Municipal Council, Mangalore.

******

x x x

7. With pardonable pride, we wish to submit that this council is ahead of many other municipal councils in respect of the advance made in the imparting of elementary education. For want of sufficient funds we are compelled to locate some of our schools in rented buildings and many of these have been objected to by the educational authorities. In order to enable the council to combat against this disadvantage, Government was pleased to sanction a subsidy of Rs. 10,500~~0~~ in G.O.No. 739 L.E. (dated 30.4.1926 and of Rs 1515 in G.O. No 1954 R. Edn) dated 2-10-1928 and on the strength of this sanction the council acquired two plots, one by the application of the Land Acquisition Act for the Bolar School and the other by private negotiations for the Market-Ward Boys' school. We are extremely grieved to say that the grants sanctioned were withheld in both the cases on certain technical grounds. We request you may be pleased to go through the connected papers and see that the grant now withheld and for which this council was entitled to in equity and justice is paid to us and thus the council is relieved of the burden.

(H)

Hon'ble M.1's remarks

~~The notes of the Hon'ble M's [illegible]~~

"The address was received on 25.5.31 Please put up a note"

B M
2/6.

L. 2851/A
3/7/31

The above extract may be sent to Law (Edn) Depm for necessary action.

2/7

Ref Memo 18913-2 Law
2.7.31

Ram
2/7

Law (Edn) Memo

GOVT ... OF ...
9-JUL 1931
L.W.

L.228
15/6/31

Education deptt

The council's request for a reconsideration of the orders referred to on page 1 ante has been sent u.o. to the D.P.I. for remarks. The return of the papers by the D.P.I. may be awaited.

3/7.

6/7

7/7.

201

Edn. 278A
20.1.31.

Law Dept. III-8—2,000—22-12-30.

QUESTION.—No. 395 for the meeting of the Legislative Council to be held on the 27th January 1931.

SUBMITTED that two copies of this Question may be forwarded to the Law (Education) Department.

The Question has been admitted.

19/1

19/1/31

12-C

U.O. No. 280/31 *dated* 19-1-31

To
The Law (Edn) Department.

Education dept.

Clauses (a) and (b) of the question-Bolar boys' scho

3 of Ⓘ

In G.O.No:1954 L.E d/ 2-10-28 the Govt promised subsidies to the Municipal Council, Mangalore, towards the acquisition of land for extensions to the buildings for the undermentioned elementary schools

Name of school	Estimated cost	Subsidy promised.
(1) Bolar boys' school	3030	1,515
(2) Bokkapatna girls' school	5410	2,705

p 1-2 of G.O. no 1940/25.9.30 Ⓥ

2. The actual cost of acquisition was Rs 4,776 for item (1) and Rs 2902 for item (2) and the Chairman requested that a half grant based on the actual cost ~~in both the cases~~ might be given in each case as the total cost in both the cases was less than the estimated cost.

no 1940/25.9.30 Ⓥ
G.O. no 2132/15.10.30 Ⓙ

The Govt sanctioned a subsidy for item (2), but refused a subsidy for item (1). The question relates to item (1)-Bolar boys' school.

p 8 of G.O. no 1940/25.9.30 Ⓥ

G.O. no 1954/2.10.28 Ⓘ

A

p 6-7 of G.O. no 1940/25.9.30 Ⓥ

3. In regard to the boys' school~~s~~, the Chairman explained that the cost had increased owing to the improvements and extensions to the building on the site, effected by the owner subsequent to the original valuation on the basis of which the Govt. had promised a subsidy. The D.P.I stated that the building purchased was reported to be quite unsuitable for school purposes and that the inspecting officers considered that it should be demolished. He said that a provincial grant should not be sanctioned towards the cost of a building which was unsuitable and should be demolished. The Director ~~had~~ also pointed out that the previous sanction of Govt ~~kx~~ to the revised estimate had not been obtained. He, however recommended the payment of the subsidy of Rs 1,515

promised by Govt instead of a subsidy equal to one half of the actual cost, (~~[illegible]~~.) Rs 2388

4. As the recommendation was inconsistent with his remark at 'A' above a further report was called for. The Director stated that, if the original building was unsuitable, there would not be any justification for reducing the grant, but that, if a suitable building had been converted into an unsuitable one, a reduction to the extent of one-half of the building alone might be made or, in other words, that a subsidy of one-half of the cost of the land alone might be given. This worked out to Rs 1,150. It was assumed that the original building must have been suitable and as it was reported that the building had been made quite unsuitable and in view of the fact that the revised estimate had not been submitted to Govt for sanction, a subsidy for the building was refused-G.O.No: 2132 d/ 15-10-30. In refusing the subsidy the fact that the Council was on the black list was also a guiding factor.

p. 2 ante
memo on pp 1-2 (J)
Go No 2132 / 15.10.30 (J)

p. 3 7 (J)
p. 7 7 (J)
(J)
p 7 7 (J)

5. Clause (c) For orders whether the answer may be in the negative. Attention is solicited to G.Os. No:2332 d/ 12-11-30 and 2599 d/ 20-12-30 declining to reconsider the orders in G.O.2132 d/ 15-10-30 s for the reasons, the M.L.C may be told that the xtensions carried out to the building after a romise of grant was made are reported to have endered it unsuitable for school purposes and the previous sanction of Govt to the revised estimate was not obtained.

7
(V), (Z)
(J)

6. Clauses (d) and (e) of the question.

Market ward school.

ef

In G.O.No: 739 L.E d/ 30-4-26 the Govt promised he payment to the M.C, Mangalore, of a subsidy f Rs 10,500 towards the construction of buildings or (a) the Attavar boys' school and (b) Kadiri girls' chool and the acquisition of buildings for (c) Pentlandpetta

(H)
p 4 7 (H)

26

girls' school and (d) Market ward boys' school.

57 [illegible]
2484 - (L)
27-11-29

In 1927 the C.M.C, Mangalore, report~~ed that~~ the Council had dropped the ~~idea of~~ purchasing of the building originally selected for the schools (c) and ~~(d) and~~ requested a subsidy of Rs 3,880 for the construction of a building for school (c), the subsidy already promised being diverted thereto. In 1929 the Chairman and Council proposed to construct buildings for (a) and (c) alone at an estimated cost of Rs 30,140 (against the estimate of Rs 21,000 for four buildings) and requested a subsidy equal to one-half of the revised estimate. He stated that the construction of buildings for (b) and (d) had been postponed for want of funds. The Director stated that a cheaper design should be devised and that the building should be planned so as to provide only for the existing strength and the strength that might be expected in the near future and to admit of future expansion instead of providing accommodation immediately for a large number of pupils. The Chairman was accordingly informed that the plans and estimates might be revised in accordance with the Director's suggestions and the scheme submitted in time for consideration in connection with the B.E for 1931-32.

(L)

1-77 (L)

1-2 (L)

no (L)

11-24
93 P
410

7. As regards item (d)-Market ward school-to which the present question relates, the Chairman reported in February 1930 that a site had been purchased at a cost of Rs 6,540 and requested the payment of a subsidy of Rs 3,270 He stated that the site had to be purchased as the owner might demand a higher price later on and as the owner of the rented building in which the school was located wanted the Council to pay enhanced rent or to vacate the building. The Director remarked that the Council would have proceeded in a more business-like way if it had confined its attention and limited expenditure to the proposals for

97 P

1-7-7

~~xxxxxxx~~

65. 27\

constructing buildings for the Attavar boys' school and the Pentlandpetta girls' school as originally proposed by it, instead of purchasing a site which it did not propose~~d~~ to utilise at present. He, therefore, said that the Govt would be justified if they rejected the Council's request.

K.C. G.O.Ms. 2484 / 27.11.29 (L)

G.O.Ms. 110 / 593 / 3.4.30 (P)

The Govt accordingly declined to comply with the Council's request. The Council has not submitted a revised scheme for buildings for the other schools as directed in G.O.No: 2484 d/ 27-11-29. If the Council revises its proposals and the site purchased for the Market Ward school is found suitable and the price paid reasonable the whole scheme can be considered in connection with the B.E for 1932-33.

(L)

'x' on p. ~~593~~ G.O.Ms. 593 / 3.4.30 (P)

8. A draft answer is submitted. The answer to b & c has been revised ~~accordingly~~

AD 27-1

26.1.31

M3. 27/1

AS 27/1

Grants to Mangalore Municipal Council for acquiring sites for schools.

*361 *Q.*—Mr. M. S. Sreshta : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Government had promised the Municipal Council, Mangalore, a subsidy not exceeding one-half of the actual cost subject to the maximum of Rs. 1,515 towards the cost of the acquisition of land for the extension of the municipal elementary school at Bolar;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that Government have refused to pay the promised subsidy after the acquisition of the said land on the ground that the cost of the acquisition has exceeded the original estimate;

(*c*) whether the Government will be pleased to pay at least the amount promised; if not, why not;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that a similar subsidy was promised towards the acquisition of a site for the market ward school; and

(*e*) whether the said subsidy has been paid after the acquisition of the site; and, if not, for what reasons?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) The payment of subsidy was refused because (1) it was reported that the building on the site had been altered after the promise of a subsidy, was quite unsuitable for school purposes and should be demolished and (2) the previous sanction of Government to the revised estimate had not been obtained. The Government do not propose to reconsider the orders already passed.

(*d*) Yes.

(*e*) A subsidy not exceeding Rs. 10,500 was promised in 1926, towards the purchase of buildings for four schools of which the Market Ward School was one.

In 1929 the council proposed to construct buildings for *two* of the schools at a cost far in excess of the original estimate for the *four* schools and to defer the construction of buildings for the other two schools for want of funds, the Market Ward School being one of these. The council was asked to prepare plans and estimates for the two schools on a more economical basis and to submit them for the consideration of Government. In 1930 the council requested the payment of a subsidy for a site purchased for the Market Ward School against its previous decision to postpone the scheme for the construction of a building for the school. It did not also submit revised plans and estimates for buildings for the two other schools referred to. Payment of a subsidy was refused as the Government considered that the council should have confined its attention to immediate requirements instead of purchasing a site which would not be required in the near future.

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—"May I know why the Government are not willing to pay at least the promised subsidy though not the excess sum involved?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—"The reason is not really the amount involved but the unsuitability of the building for purposes of a school."

२७

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" May I know what the objection is for giving the promised subsidy at least ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" As a matter of fact the subsidy was intended for the acquisition of a site for school, and so I do not think the Government would be justified in giving a subsidy for the site when the building put up was unsuitable and had to be demolished and a new one has been erected without the sanction of the Government."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" Then may I know whether Government will pay any subsidy towards the cost of the site only ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" When that proposal comes forward, it will be considered."

Mr. M. S Sreshta :—" Is it correct to say that an unsuitable building was put up by the Municipal Council ? I believe the unsuitable building was there already. May I know if that is correct ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" Possibly it may be. But the point is that it was unsuitable for locating a school and it was demolished and a new building was erected."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta :—" In view of the fact that the original building was not put up by the Municipal Council, and because it was unsuitable for a school another building had to be put up by the Municipal Council, will the hon. Minister revise his order ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" I shall look into the matter. I cannot promise that I shall revise."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" Is it not a fact that that building was recommended by the District Educational authorities for a school ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" Notice, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" If it had been recommended by the Educational authorities will Government give the full subsidy ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" That is purely a hypothetical question."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta :—" In view of the fact that the excess amount is only about Rs. 350, will the Government pay the subsidy ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" There is no question of excess amount. It is a question of the original subsidy itself."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar :—" With reference to the answer to clause (e), it is said that the Council was asked to prepare the plans and estimates on a more economical basis. May I know what are the items that were considered to be extravagant by Government ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" Notice, Sir."

With reference to the portion marked A above, attention is solicited to paragraph 1 of the notes on pages 6-7 of G.O. No. 2132 L.&M. of 15.10.30. (F) The Director ~~said~~ stated in September last that he was not in a position to say whether the original building was or was not suitable (but he was positive that the building had been made unsuitable) ~~Tha the~~ may now be asked to

page 4 of (F)

pp 6-7 of G.O. No. 1940 25.9.3

(V)

~~8~~ 9 ✓

✓78A

to say whether the original building was recommended by the Dt. Edl. authorities. It is possible that the municipal council selected the site with the building on the advice of the D.E.O. If it had been so selected, it may be reasonable to give a half grant ~~on~~ towards the cost of the site alone.

p. 7 of form 2132 / 15.10.30 (F)

A draft memo is submitted

AS
25.3.

24.3.31

24/3.

p5 cf Issued as Memo No. 278A 2, d. 26.5.31

I have seen the Vice-Chairman. The matter may, I think, be reconsidered on receipt of the D.P.I.'s reply.

A.F.W.D.
1.4.31.

C No. 2136A] From the Vice-C. M.C., Mangalore, No. 182/31-32, d. 3.6.31.
2166A] " D.P.I. No. 584B/31, d. 9.5.31.

Please see portion marked A on page 7 ante. The D.P.I., who was consulted, says that none of the inspecting officers recommended that the buildings which originally stood on the site acquired for the Bolar Boys' School were suitable for school ~~purposes~~ use. It is not, however, clear whether the inspecting

p10 cf

officers

9

Inspector

officers were consulted at all by the Chairman when the site and buildings were selected for acquisition for the school.

2. The Chairman has again addressed the Govt: requesting a reconsideration of the previous orders and the payment of subsidies towards the cost of the sites acquired for the Bolar Boys' School and the Market Ward Boys' School. The position is briefly summarised below:—

pp 6-9 Cf.

3. Bolar Boys' School.

In G.O. No. 1954 Education, d/ 2.10.28, the Govt. promised a subsidy not exceeding Rs. 1515/- to the Municipal Council, Mangalore, towards the acquisition of land for extensions to the school building. The cost of acquisition was originally estimated at Rs. 3030/-. The actual cost of acquisition, however, amounted to Rs. 4776/-. The increase in the cost of acquisition was due to the fact that the owner of the building on the site effected improvements and extensions ~~[illegible]~~ subsequent to the original valuation on the basis of which the subsidy was promised. When the Chairman applied for the payment of a subsidy equal to one half of the actual cost of acquisition,

(I)

A on page 8 of G.O. 1960 Edn
25.9.30 (V)

The D.P.I. stated that the building purchased was reported to be quite unsuitable for school purposes and that the inspecting officer considered that it should be demolished. He said that a Provincial grant should not be sanctioned towards the cost of a building which was unsuitable and should be demolished. The Director also pointed out that the previous sanction of the Govt. to the revised estimate had not been obtained. He however, recommended the payment of the subsidy of Rs. 1575/- promised by the Govt. instead of a subsidy equal to one-half of the actual cost (Rs. 2388).

para 6 of the Director's letter on page 6 of f.o. 1240/25-9-30 (V)

para 6, p 7 of f.o. (V)

As there was an inconsistency in the Director's recommendation, a further report was called for. The Director stated that, if the original building was unsuitable, there would not be any justification for reducing the grant, but that if a suitable building had been converted into an unsuitable one, a reduction to the extent of one-half of the value of the building alone might be made or, in other words, that a subsidy of one-half of the cost of the land alone might be given. This worked out to Rs. 1150/-. It was assumed that the original building must have been suitable and as it was reported that

para 2, pages 3-4 of fo 2132/15-10-30 (J)

ra 3, p 4 of f.o. (J)

33

that the building had been made quite unsuitable and in view of the fact that the revised estimate had not been submitted to the Govt. for sanction, any no subsidy was ~~no subsidy was~~ paid ~~paid~~ for the site or buildings. In refusing the subsidy the fact that the Council was on the black list was also ~~a~~ guiding factor.

Cf notes on pages 6-7 of F. 2132/15-10-30 (J)

A reconsideration of this ~~order~~ order was subsequently refused twice.

fos 2332/12-11-30 (V) & 2599/30-12-3 (Z)

The Chairman now says, that the original intention of the Municipal Council was not to make use of the building standing on the site but to extend ~~on the~~ the existing school building on the acquired site which was adjacent to the school.

X on page 7 Cf

He therefore requests that a subsidy equal to one-half of the actual cost of the acquisition may be paid. In view of what the Chairman now says, it is for consideration whether ~~a subsidy of Rs. 2300/- or one half of the actual cost will be given. If this is not accepted,~~ ~~at least~~ a subsidy equal to ~~the~~ one half of the cost of the site alone or Rs. 1150/- may ~~perhaps~~ be given.

4. Market Ward Boys' School.

In G.O. No. 739 Edn., d/ 30.4.26, (A) the Govt. promised a subsidy of Rs. 10500/- towards the construction of buildings for two schools

schools and the acq----n of buildings for two others. The Market Ward Boys' School was one of the latter. The Municipa Council subsequently revised its original proposals. In November 1929 the Director reported that the proposal to purchase ~~the~~ buildings for ~~these two schools~~ two of the schools had been dropped by the Municipal ouncil and that the Council also proposed o postpone the construction of any ~~but~~ uilding for the Market Ward Boys' School, ill funds were available.

[illegible] Director's [illegible] 1-20 of [illegible] 27-11- ①

M

In February 1930 the Chairman, however, reported that a site had been purchased at a cost of Rs. 6,540/- for the Market Ward Boys' School and requested the payment of a subsidy of one half of the cost (Rs. 3,270). He stated that the site had to be purchased as the owner might demand a higher price later on and as the owner of the rented building in which the school was locate wanted the Council to pay ~~at~~ an enhanced rent or to vacate the building. The D.P.I. remarked that the Council would have proceeded in a more business-like way if it had confined its attention and limited expenditure to the proposals for constructing buildings for the ther schools, as proposed, instead of purchasing site which it did not propose to utilise at present

P. 1-2 of f. 593/3-4-30 Ⓟ

page 9 of 593/3-4-30 Ⓟ

1-8 of f. Ⓟ

present. He therefore said that the Govt. would be justified, if they rejected the Council's request. At the same time he added that he should be prepared to recommend that ~~that~~ the application be entertained only if the site acquired was found to be suitable as regards situation and sufficient in extent, ~~that~~ if the price paid was reasonable and if ~~that~~ the site would be used for school purposes in the near future. The Chairman's request for the subsidy was, however, negatived in G.O. No. 593 Edn., dt 3.6.30.

page 7 of 80. (P)

(P)

The Chairman now reports that when the question of the purchase of a building for the school as originally proposed was dropped, there an alternative ~~sait~~ site selected for the school, and ~~estimated~~ valued by the Revenue Dept at Rs. 7395/-, ~~and~~ that the question of acquiring this land was also dropped as the cost was considered heavy, and that by private negotiations favourable to the Council, the and was purchased for Rs. 6520-13-, which as less than the ~~cost~~ value as estimated by the Rev-Dept. he also says that the Council would have lost he ~~chang~~ chance of purchasing the site on uch liberal terms, if the purchase had been delayed and that there was no other ~~sit~~ uitable site available for the school. In hese circumstances he requests that the

page 9 of

rders

(P) orders passed in G.O. No. 593 Edn., d/3.4.30 may be reconsidered and that a subsidy may be given for the site purchased for the school. It is also reported that the Dt. Edl. Officer and the Executive Engineer have approved of the site as suitable for the school. It is now for consideration whether the chairman's request may be complied with. The Dt. Edl. Officer may, if necessary, be required to inspect the ~~st~~ site specially and report on the suitability etc. of the site.

p. 9 cf

5. A small provision of Rs. 47,500/ only has been made in the current year's budget for the payment of subsidies to local bodies for the construction of elementary school buildings and this provision does not include any amount for the items dealt with above. If it is considered that the Chairman's request may be considered favourably, as a special case, the file may be sent to the Finance Dept. for remarks.

HB
1.6.31.

~~Herewith the~~

There seems to be a good case for a grant of Rs 1150/- for the Bolar boys School, as regards the market ward School site, it seems necessary to know for certain whether

Sd
2/6

a 3 on p. 47
G. O. Ⓣ

37

2

the site is suitable the case may first be sent to the D.P.I. U.O. for remarks

AS
5/6

L.E. 2166 A-1
10.6.31

~~D.P.I. U.O.~~
D.P.I.'s Office

U.O.Reply No. 584 B/31 d 19.7.31

7-JUN 1931
LAW DEPARTMENT

I agree that payment of Rs.1150 as regards the Bolar Boys' school may be sanctioned. // As regards the Market Ward school the site proposed was visited by the D.E.O. and was approved by him. It is stated to be suitable for school building and to be accessible to all classes including depressed classes. The existing rented building which is located in unhealthy surroundings and is without any latrine accommodation can provide for only 216 pupils against a strength of 260. Therefore better accommodation has been found to be necessary.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
11 JUN 1931
R.C.584B/31

B

24 JUL 1931
LAW DEPARTMENT

RG
19.7.31

L. Ch 3222 A
24/7/31

Education Dept

In view of the remarks made by the D.P.I. it seems that a subsidy may be sanctioned towards the site for the Market Ward school also.

Rs.3270

The file may be sent U.O. to Finance for remarks.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT.
29 JUL 1931
FINANCE DEPT.

NKE
25/7

Sd
25/7

AS
29/7

Fin

L.E. 2166 A-2
29.7.31

2285 3 Exp
29.7.31

~~16~~ 58

It is proposed to sanction a half grant of Rs. 4420 to the Mangalore Municipal Council toward the acquisition of site for the following two elementary school buildings:-

Law DS's note on p.14 above
E.T.'s " " on p.15 above

	Rs.
(1) Bolar Boys' school	1,150
(2) Market Ward Boys' school	3,270
	4,420

2. Bolar Boys' School:

[illegible] 1954 Edn. / [illegible].10.28 Ⓘ
B on p.2 [illegible] Ⓥ
[illegible] 2132 Edn. / 15.10.30 Ⓙ
[illegible] on p.7 [illegible] Ⓙ
X on p 7 F

In October 1928, the Govt. promised a half gr not exceeding Rs. 1,515. The actual cost of acqui tion, however, amounted to Rs 4776. Govt. refused pay any grant as their prior approval to the revis estimate was not obtained by the Municipal Council and as it was reported that the building on the sit acquired was unsuitable for school purposes. The Municipal Council ~~is~~ was also on the black list (Civil Disobedience Movement).

The Chairman now reports that the original intention of the Municipal Council was not to make use of the building standing on the site, but to extend the existing school building on the acquired site which ~~was~~ is adjacent to the School. Law (Edn.) propose to pay a grant equal to one half of the cost of the site alone, viz. Rs. 1150.

A

Submitted that before agreeing to the proposal, Law (Edn.) may be requested to state whether a grant towards the cost of the extension of the existing school building on the site already acquired will have to be given and if so what the amount will be.

3. Market Ward Boys' School:

[illegible] 739 Edn. / 30.4.26 Ⓗ
M on p.12 [illegible]

This is one of the 4 schools for which a total half grant of Rs. 10,500 was promised by Govt. in 1926. In November 1929, owing to want of funds, the Municipal Council proposed to postpone the

VI of

construction of a building for this school. (The promise of a grant made in 1926 lapsed).

A

Subsequently, however, in February 1930, the Chairman reported that a site had been purchased at a cost of Rs. 6540 and asked for a half grant (Rs. 3270). The D.P.I. did not recommend the payment of a grant as the Municipal Council did not propose to construct the building then and as the site was purchased before the grant was applied for. The Govt declined to give a grant.

(P)

pp 1-2 of 36593 Edn
3.4.30

pp 6-7 ibid

p.10 ibid

p.9 CF

The Chairman now reports that the site had to be purchased urgently by private negotiation as it was about to be sold to a private party and as its subsequent acquisition under the Land Acquisition Act would have been more costly. The Dt. Educational Officer, and the Exe. Engr. have approved of the site: and the D.P.I. has stated that the school is in need of better accommodation. Law (Edn.) propose to sanction a subsidy towards the site, viz., Rs. 3270.

D on p 9 CF
p.15 above

Submitted that Law (Edn.) may be requested to ascertain when the construction of the building on the site already acquired will be taken up by the Municipal Council and whether a grant will have to be given from Provl. funds.

B

4. Funds: There is no provision in the current year's budget for a grant for the 2 items referred to above. The proposal will have to be treated as a Part II scheme. In view of the present financial stringency, it may not be possible to provide for these works in the budget for 1932-33.

para 5 on p.14 above

S

6.8.31.

7-8-31

Fin. U.O. 22853. Exp-1

LE 35-11/A
11-8-31

GOVERNM 11 AUG 1931

~~18~~ U

Education Deptt

A draft Memo to the D.P.I. is subd. with reference to the Finance Deptt.'s note sidelined 'A' and 'B' at pages 16-17 ante

RM 12/8.

AS 13.8

12/8

pages 11 - 12 C.F. (Issued as Memo No. 2166 A - 3 dated 14- 8- 1931)

Pages 13 - 17 C. F. C.No.s 4068 A and 4069 A - From the D.P.I., No.s 584 B -31 and 1540 /31 dated 17-9-31.

pages 13 - 14 C.F. The D.P.I. states that a subsidy of Rs.1,500 (one-half of the estimated cost) will be required for the proposed extension for the Bolar school and that ~~th~~ the work of constructing a building for the Marketward school will be undertaken as soon as a subsidy is sanctioned.

pages 17 - 19 C.F. 2. The Chairman has ~~separately~~ also submitted an application for a subsidy of Rs.4,000(one-half of the estimated cost) towards the construction of a building for the Market-ward school for consideration as a Part II scheme for

pages 15 - 16 C.F. 932-33. The D.E.O. considers that the work is urgent and the Director recommends that the question of paying a subsidy may be considered if Govt. are able to provide funds in 1932-33 for new schemes.

3. Owing to the financial stringency this department has been refusing to consider all applications

K.W.

for subsidies for new building schemes. It does not seem possible to make an exception in the case of the Municipal Council, Mangalore. For orders whether the Council may be informed accordingly.

subsidies for the acquisition of sit
for the Bolar and
Market ward schools an
for the building for
the latter.

BM
23/9

Submitted. May be so informed
24/9

26/9

M3. Yes
26/9

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS LAW DEPARTMENT
1-OCT-31

1.10

M1.
1/10

A draft order is subd.
2.10

BM
2/10

2/10

42

Sectt. II-5 (a)

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied ..		23/X
When examined ..	5/10/31	
When signed ..		
When ~~despatched~~ ~~cross~~		

L.C.Q - [illegible]

Education DEPARTMENT.

Subsidy - Municipal Council, Mangalore - Bolar and Marketwa Boys' schools - site and building - Refused.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 593 Edn. dated 45/3No 3 - 4 - 1930 Ⓟ

" " " " 2599 " " 20 - 12 - 1930 ②

READ ALSO :—

C. No. 278 A ✓ From the C. M. C., Mangalore, No. 182/31-32 dated 6 - 5 - 1931. 10 pp 6-9 C.F.

2134 A ✓ " 588/31-32 " 29-7- 1931 p 17C

2166 A ✓

2851 A ✓

" " 3222 A ✓ " " D. P. I. p 13 C.F. " 584 B/31, 17-9- 1931.

3511 A ✓

4068 A ✓

4069 A ✓

" " 4146 A ✓ " " " " " 1540 B/31, 17-9- 1931. p 15C

ORDER.

Ms.

No. 1746 dated 3 X. 1931.

Ⓟ + ②

Owing to the financial stringency the Govt. are unable to reconsider the orders already issued regardin the payment of a Subsidy to the Municipal council, Mangalore, towards the cost of the sites acquired for the Bolar and Marketward boys' schools. ~~and~~ For the same reaso they are also unable to consider application for a subsidy towards the cost of the construction of a building for the Marketward Boys' School. To

The C. E. [illegible] Mangalore

D. P. I.

PAM
2/10

AO
3.10

Despd. by Van
Post
[illegible]
Despr's initials
Date 5·10·31